

THE  
ANSWER  
OF  
Giles Firmin,

TO THE  
Vain and Unprofitable Question put to him,  
and Charged upon him by Mr. GRANTHAM,  
In his Book, Entitled,  
*The INFANTS ADVOCATE:*

VIZ.

*Whether the greatest Part of Dying Infants  
shall be Damned?*

Which *Advocate*, while he shuts all Infants out of the  
*Visible Church*, and denies them *Baptism*, opens Heaven to  
all Dying Infants, justifying those of his Party, who admit  
them all as he doth, into Heaven *without Regeneration*.

*The Preface may be very Useful for the Children of Godly Parents.*

*Quo loco, illud præfandum esse videtur, Misericordiam nostram erga parvulos  
jam defunctos, nihil eis prodesse, & contra nihil eisdem obesse, sententiæ no-  
stræ severitatem: multum autem nobis obesse, si ob inutilem Misericordiam  
erga defunctos, pertinaciter aliquid contra Scripturas aut Ecclesiam de-  
fendamus. Id circo non affectum quendam humanum, quo plerique moveri  
solent, sed Scripturæ, Conciliorum, & Patrum Sententiam consulere debe-  
mus. Bellar. Præf. To. 4. p. 145. a.*

- <sup>2</sup> Ephes. 3. And were by Nature Children of Wrath, even as others.  
<sup>3</sup> Joh. 3. 5. Except a Man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.  
<sup>12</sup> Heb. 14. Follow—Holiness, without which no Man shall see God.

LONDON: Printed in the Year 1689.

12 Feb. 14. Follow.—Hollins, without which no plan could be God.  
 13 Feb. 15. Except a Man be born, he can not see the Kingdom of God.  
 14 Feb. 16. And write by the children of Wrath, even so.

LONDON: Printed in the Year 1636.

# THE ANSWER TO HIS PREFACE.

**T**HE Preface is more considerable than his whole Book, there being something in it which concerns our Practice. In it he justifies himself in his *scorning* at me, for the experience I have found of the benefit of *Abraham's*, and my Baptismal Covenant when an Infant. Let the Reader take it shortly thus :

The Covenant I mention is, as I said, that Covenant which God made with our Father *Abraham*, and his Seed, 17 Gen. 7. which Covenant holds \* still with Believers and their Seed, and shall hold so long as there are Believers in Christ [ *Abraham's* Seed, 3 Gal. 29. ] upon Earth ; unless the *Anabaptists* can shew us where God hath *expressly* Repealed *that* Covenant, as he hath done other Covenants. To which I have spoken †.

My Father then being a Son [as my Mother a Daughter] of *Abraham*, this Covenant ran down to his Seed : He could plead this Covenant for us ; and when I came to Understanding, I did plead it for my self. Here was a Price in my Hand, and I resolved to improve it. Besides this Covenant, I read other Promises made to the Seed of Godly Parents, as 20 *Exod.* 6. 30 *Deut.* 6. 112 *Psal.* 2. 20 *Prov.* 7. 43 *Isa.* 3. &c. The Spirit of God did not inspire these Penmen to write these Promises to fill up Paper, that we should only read them, and not make use of them : let Children of such Parents look to this. These Promises, this Covenant, I believed, I highly prized, I begg'd the fulfilling of them many Years, being willing || to have *Abraham's*

\* I gave him six  
Scriptures  
to prove it,  
but he not  
one on the  
contrary.

† See Scri-  
pture Wor.  
p. 8, 9, 10:  
17 *Prov.*  
16.

|| Nos volu-  
mus sed ille  
facit ut ve-  
limus Au-  
gust.



God to be *my God*, as he was *His*, and my Father's God, and I willing to be *His*, as *Abraham* and my Father were. And since he had promised *Blessings* several times, but did not specifie what *Blessings*, I chose my *Blessings*, to wit, *All Spiritual Blessings in Christ Jesus*, 1 *Ephes.* 3. without which I esteemed nothing to be a *Blessing*, *Non Entitie*, being a state far better than all other *Blessings* without them.

And whereas I was for several Years troubled about *Legal Preparations, and Qualifications of Promises* \*, [ which I do not wonder, tho' Mr. *Grantham*, and his Sect, are never troubled about being *Active*, not *Passive*, in their own *Begetting* † ] I found in this Covenant, and these Promises a great help. Here God offered, yea, Covenanted to be *my God*, would I take him for *my God*, and give up my self to *him*; this I found my Heart willing to do.

\* As 11  
Matth. 28.  
61 Isa. 1.  
19 Luke  
10. &c.  
† Regene-  
ration and  
Converfi-  
on differ.

And whereas upon this *Covenant-Interest*, my Parents did dedicate me to God in my Baptism, when I came to understand my *Baptismal-Covenant*, what was contained in it, I blessed that God who was aforehand with me: I owned my *Dedication*, and for many Years followed God, that he would please to fulfil his part of the Covenant, and in the strength thereof I would endeavour to fulfil mine. And in these Covenants have I found Relief under many, yea many many Temptations.

This is the Sum of what I wrote. *Plea* from page 63. to page 72.

To this Mr. *Grantham* answers, *It would make a well Man sick, to see what work he makes of it, for after all his shifting from Post to Pillar, he only gets Stomach to reject the Council of God against himself*, 7 *Luke* 30. If this be not *scoffing*, let the Reader judge; and that not only a *scoffing* at my *Experience*, but at that *Duty* which is incumbent upon all Baptized Children under *Abraham*, and their *Baptismal Covenant*. But in this he justifies himself.

Presi mp.  
p. 6.

The next thing you charge me with, *Is eating of Blood*, contrary to the Decrees of the Apostles and Elders, 15 *Acts*. I say with B. *Austin*, *Tho' the Ceremonial Law be dead, yet it is fit it should have a comely Burial*. And having been buried so many hundred Years, that I may profess my Faith in these Truths, viz. *That the Blood which makes the Atonement for my Soul, is shed*, 17 *Levit.* 10. 11. with 1 *Col.* 20. 2 *Ephes.* 13. 14.

Secondly, *That Christ hath broken down the Partition-Wall*, [ in which Wall Blood was one Stone ] between Jew and Gentile, 2 *Ephes.*



Thirdly, *That there is nothing unclean in it self*, 14 Rom. 14. I say, to declare my Faith in these Truths, I would now eat a *Blood-Pudding* in the face of Mr. Grantham, or any Jew, provided it be prepared S. A. that is, saith Mr. Grantham, *Sir Anabaptist*. No indeed Sir, you are as much mistaken now, as when you told us, *Transubstantiation was never heard of, till it was invented in the Council of Trent*. S. A. that is, *Secundum Artem*. \*: If a good Cook hath the preparing of them, else I care not for them. But I thank you for the sport you have made us, by interpreting S. A.

\* As Physicians in their Bills, let the Bill be prepared S. A.

For the rest of your Preface, I told you if there were any false Stories blame not me, they came from your own Party, boasting of you very much: As since you wrote against me, a Friend of mine being at London, and discoursing with one of your Tribe, about disputing, *We*, said he, *will set a Taylor to Dispute with him*. That I see this Taylor is a great Man in the *Anabaptists* Opinion, and in his own too, else he would not have carried himself so proudly in the *Arminian* Controversie, when I gave him no occasion to meddle with it. It being a Controversie, in which Pious, and very Learned Men, other manner of Men than He and I am, have laboured very much, that this Man should jump off his *Taylor's-shop-board*, and after some Study, take the *Doctors Chair*, as if he were the Man to determine those Questions, when I see he is but a Smatterer, and knows not the depth of that Controversie. Upon this ground, with the former, finding him a *Scoffer*, and one as I understand, that denies Communion with all Churches [tho' nothing which is Human is imposed] but *dip* Churches, I did not treat him with that Respect, as I have done other Men.

To one of his Disciples that sows the same *Darnel* in these parts, which he doth elsewhere, I mentioned three Pastors, and Churches; I am sure for Holiness and Abilities, there are none such among the *Anabaptists*, no nor under the Sun; yet he, forsooth, would have no Communion with them, they were not *Dipt*, I desire no acquaintance with such.

For my own part, I have held Communion in the Holy Supper, and do daily in my Prayers remember one *Anabaptist*, whom I found sound in other Points, and walking humbly; so that certainly I am no *Despiser of them who Worship God according to his Will*, as you charge me to be †, and so would prove me, *not to do the Works of Abraham*. If *Re-baptizing* were Worship, according to his Will, which I deny: As for Baptizing by Dipping of those who were never Baptized, I am not against it, if Administred by one

Qualified,

Qualified, Called, and Ordained according to the Gospel. This Charge is as true as divers others I meet with in your Book ; out of which I will only take the most material Things, and let your other Impertinencies alone.

16 Decemb. 1688.

*The Servant of the  
Seed of Believers,*

G. FIRMIN.

---

THE

---

---



---

# THE ANSWER TO HIS Vain Question.

**A**S for the *Two Questions* I propounded to the *Anabaptists*, you tell me, You have answered them, and so you have done with them. But others say, You have answered nothing. And I say, If they cannot be answered better than you have done, we will go on to Baptize the Infants of Believing Parents without any scruple.

Now you give me *Two* other Questions.

**I. Quest.** *Whether God required Baptism, or any other Rite, to be necessary to the Salvation of Infants ?*

*Answ.* What need this Question, since I told you \* I do not think \* Plea, p. Baptism to be absolutely necessary, either for Infants, or Adult Persons, as if without it they could not be saved. I named the Scripture to prove it : I gave the Opinion of our Protestants ; I add now, some of the Papists, even *Lumbard* † himself is of the same Judgment. 20.

The same was, and is my Opinion concerning *Circumcision*, which † L. 4. Dist. 4. made me wonder you should so often tell your Reader, twice in one pag. 21. [where you tell me, *You admire my great blindness*] that I have said, *If Isaac had died before he had been eight days old, he had not been saved*: An abominable falshood, I never had such a thought. You say, pag. 6. *You have done me no wrong, in shewing my Opinion*: Yes, Mr. *Grantbam*, as much wrong as *Falshood* can do Truth. If your



your Choler have done boiling, the Fumes whereof troubled your sight, rub your Eyes, and put on your Spectacles, and read the former Paragraphs, upon which thole words about *Isaac* depend, and you will find this Sence. I was speaking of the Grace of God in making that Covenant with *Abraham*, and his Seed, and Sealing it. Suppose, I said, it were true which you say, *That all dying Infants are saved*, yet certainly there is a Blessing in this Covenant, that God makes and Seals with *Isaac*, said I, for God does not make Covenants in vain. But how does this prove, what you charge me with? I doubt not but as God saved Infants before Circumcision was Instituted, so he did after without it.

But tho' there be no such *absolute necessity*, as I said before, yet when God Institutes any Ordinance there is a *necessity* lies upon us, to observe his Institution reverently, and I do believe God doth convey Grace by them. For, as I said concerning *Circumcision*, it had *Spiritual Ends*; God strictly chargeth this Ordinance to be administered to Infants of eight days old, which could not Co-work with him in the Administration of it; then he himself must do it, else the Spiritual Ends could not be attained, there is only a sign, but not the thing signified in any one Infant; so the Ordinance is but in vain, which do not consist with the Wisdom, Grace, and Holiness of God. 1. As it was in Circumcision, so in Baptism, which succeed in the room of it. Though Circumcision and Baptism are nothing without the Spirit, yet with the Spirit, Baptism is not inferiour to Circumcision: He did work then, and doth work now, when and where he pleaseth with it.

II. Quest. *Whether the greatest part of dying Infants shall be Damned?*

Ans. A very Vain Question: Take your Answer from *Bellarmin*, in my Title-Page. But further, in your First Book, p. 7. you charge some *Independents*, and *Presbyterians* with this cruel Doctrine, but you name none. In this you charge only *Presbyterians*; and any Man who reads your Title-Page, will conclude that I am a *Presbyterian*, and that I own that *Cruel Doctrine*. I answer:

I hold Communion both with *Independents* and *Presbyterians*, but that I am a *Presbyterian*, is more then I knew before, or know now.

As to the Opinion you charge me with, Mr. *Grantham*, if you be a Man of Truth, and would not justly be charged with a Lye, name the Page in my Book, where I have written any such thing: Sure I am, *I never spake it, I never wrote it, I never thought it.*

It was never the Question. Those which I treated of, were:

Quest. I. *Whether God Regenerates any Infants?*

2. *Whether*

2. Whether God Circumcise the Hearts of any Infants ? [Which your Disciple said true, come both to one.] Both which were denied by two of your Sect, and the latter denied by your self \*. \* Against

I proved, if Infants be *Saved*, they must be *Regenerated*, 3 *Joh.* 3. Mr. Petto. They must be *Sanctified*. Heaven is an Inheritance only for *Sanctified* Persons, 20 *Act.* 32. and 26 *chap.* 18. They must be made *meet* for it, 1 *Col.* 12. I am sure they are not *meet* for it by Nature. P. 51.

But whether God Regenerates all Infants, or the greater, or the lesser part of Infants, I wrote not one word : How should I know what God hath not revealed, 29 *Deut.* 29. How could you then charge such a Doctrine upon me, in your Title-page ?

In the Conclusion of your Book you tell your Reader, Mr. *Firmin* seems displeased at the multitude which shall be saved ; if my Opinion be true, *all dying Infants are saved*, &c.

I shall answer you very briefly. That you might shew your self to be a Learned Man in the *Arminian* Controversie, [ which I gave you no occasion to meddle with ] you tell me, *This strange Doctrine of damning the greatest part of the World, and that before the World was—makes God the Author of all sin*, &c. To the first part I only answered by Christ's words, 7 *Matth.* 14. As for *Huberus*, and *Cælius Secundus Curio*, they were of your side. But mark your own words Mr. *Grantham*, the damning of the greatest part of the *World* ; not the greatest part of *Infants* : I hope the *World* and *Infants*, are not the same ; then as yet you cannot fasten this *Cruel Doctrine* upon me. Presump. p. 8.

As for the words of Christ, 7 *Matth.* 14. *Few find it*, you answer me, quoring 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. &c. *That the far greater part will despise the Riches of God's goodness*, &c. But I say, if they do so finally, they are damned ; and this is *strange Doctrine* with you.

As for *Infants*, say you, *they are in no danger by this Text, they may be* [ you should say *they are*, not *may be* ] *all saved*, and so the number of the saved be much greater by them. For none of them walk in the broad way, therefore they must needs go the way which lead to Life.

But I pray, is the number of them that are saved so much greater by them, that the words of Christ, *Few find it*, are not true ? Else you do not take of my Answer : You Confute not me, but our Lord, the words are his not mine.

As for your proof, *David* saith, 58 *Psal.* 3. *The wicked are estranged from the Womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.* The Apostle tells us, 1 *Joh.* 5. 19. *The whole World* [ i. e. all that are not born of God ] *lieth in wickedness* : Infants are a part of the *World*, tho' not the whole *World*. The corrupt Nature in them, do bias



and incline them to walk in the Broad Way, not in the Narrow Way. Betimes, we see their little Feet, [*i. e.* their Words and Actions] stepping in the Broad Way. So that our Lord's Words may be true, tho' the greater part of Infants be saved.

\* Tom. 4. As for the *Hellish Torments* you speak of so much, *Bellarmin* \* tells  
p. 144. the *Pelagians*, [who are your Friends] and *Carbarinus*, allow Infants  
Militissima Eternal Life, and Natural Blessedness, without any pain; other Opini-  
omnium ons you may read in him, if you please: But where the Scripture is  
pœna Aug. silent, why should we speak?

Having named *Pelagius*, and charging you in my Answer to your Book with *Pelagianism*, I will here consider your Outcry against me: p. 28. where you tell me, what you have written in your Book, which you call *Christianismus Primitivus*.

I never saw any of your Book, nor did I ever hear of your Name, till I saw your Book against my self; there I found you did own *Peccatum Originans*, but not *Originatum*. So I told you.

But for all your great Words in that Page, I still say, Mr. *Grantham* is a Man very corrupt in the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, or he must grossly contradict himself. For,

Against First, Twice in one Page you tell us, *Infants are not guilty of*  
Mr. Pet. p. any *Sin of their own*. Then they have no *Sin* of their own: It is im-  
27. possible to part *Sin and Guilt*, tho' God pardon the Punishment.

Circumci- If Infants have no *Sin* of their own, then the Administration of  
sion was Circumcision to Infants of eight days old, almost two thousand years,  
Instituted was a vain Administration.

before In a Sacrament, there is the *Sign*, and the thing *signified*. What was  
Christ, signified in Circumcision, 10 *Deut.* 10. 30 *Deut.* 6. 4 *Jer.* 4. 9 *Jer.*  
1923. Bu- 26. tells us [the *Uncircumcision of our Flesh* is joyned with our Estate,  
colc. *dead in Sin*, 2 *Col.* 13.] But if Infants have no *Sin* of their own, then  
the thing *signified* was not there; so that it was no Sacrament, but  
the Administration of a *Lye*, according to your Doctrine.

Ibid. p. 11. Secondly, You tell us, *They need not any Laws to be written in their*  
*Hearts during Infancy*.

Ans. Infants are born either with that Image in which God Created Man, or not. If they be born with it, then they never fell from God, and so have no need of Christ. If not so born, then there is a *Privation* of that Righteousness which ought to be, and a *Position* [as in a Disease] of that *Unrighteousness* and Evil, which ought not to be. This Image is not restored but in *Regeneration* in which the Law is written in the Heart.

Ibid. p. 13. Thirdly, You tell us, *Infants are innocent*. Ans. Then they never fell from God. You could stitch *Innocency*, and *Pardon* together in your former Book; now you stitch *Innocency and Sin* together. You quote Dr. Taylor to justify you: But he does not stitch *Innocency and*

Par-



Pardon together. However, I read Dr. Taylor's words; but he was neither a Prophet nor Apostle; a very godly Man, and as learned a Mr. Anthony Burgess. Man as himself, who traced him in his Writings, gives this Character of him, *He is not meerly Pelagian, Papist, Arminian, or Socinian, but an Hotch-potch of all: Like a Second Julian, in triumphing Language, with much boldness he hath decryed Original Sin, as if it were but a Non Ens.* Thus he. We know sin in one sence is not *Ens*; and that this Learned Man knew well. Dr. Taylor's Authority, and yours, are both alike to me. *\* As Ens convertitur cum Re.*

Fourthly, I suspect you from your Description of Original Sin. In both your Books you tell us: *Original Sin is that came Upon all, even Infants.* This word *Upon*, I do not understand; Paul calls it *Indwelling Sin*, 7 Rom. 17. 20. I was conceived *in sin*, 51 Psal. 5. It may have some truth in respect of Adam's Sin, by which Death passed upon all, and Judgment came upon all, 5 Rom. 12. 18. But Original Sin is not without us. *p. 23. p. 28.*

Fifthly, You tell me, *Infants have no Seminal Unbelief, nor Impenitency in them.* *p. 25.*

Answer. No wonder, since they have no Seeds of any Sin; then I hope they can easily believe, and embrace Christ upon Gospel-terms, when they come to Understanding. They can easily Repent, if they should chance to Sin. They are all born with Hearts of *Flesh*, God need not take away the *Heart of Stone* from them. But for all your Commendations of Infants, we do not find them so ready to believe, and repent, when they grow up.

Sixthly, Whereas we say, *That which will be a Thorn, will soon prick;* So we find how quickly this thorny, corrupt Nature in Infants, begin to prick, and shew itself in actual Sin, so far as they are capable, in *Revenge, Envy, Pride, Rebellion against Parents*, which lately I observ'd to my sorrow. These Acts you excuse, and give to the example of ill Tutors. But I pray, whence is it they are so apt to learn? Pelagius indeed would have Sin come in by imitation, not propagation. But Tully that Learned Heathen tells us: *Simul ac Ediri sumus in Luce, &c.* As soon as ever we are born, we are presently exercised in all manner of Evil. *Ut pene in lacte Nutricis Errorem suxisse videamur:* As if we sucked down Errour with the Nurses Milk. Compare this Heathen, with Mr. Grantham the Christian. *Tusc. l. 3.*

B. Austin's Observation of Envy, in a sucking Child, you slight: But that Godly Learned Father could judge of Envy, as well as Mr. Grantham.

As for the Scriptures you produce to clear Infants from sin, 1 Pet. 2. 1, 2. *Like new born Babies, i. e. to lay aside all malice, guile, &c.* *p. 25.*

*Answ.* You do mistake the Text ; it is, *As new Borns desire the sincere Milk*, &c. it is the *Milk*, and the *Babe* ; it is not as *new born Babes*, lay aside *Malice*, &c. If Infants have no *malice*, *guile*, &c. in *semine*, how should they lay aside what they have not ? You will make Infants guilty by your Interpretation.

For the 1 Cor. 14. 20. in *wickedness* *ignorance*, be ye *Children* : What do the Apostle mean, he would have them as *Children*, in your *sence*, without the Seeds of *Corruption*, *Unbelief*, *Impenitency*, and so cross himself in the 7 *Rom.* and 2 *Ephes.* 3. and cross the Apostle *John*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. cross to *David*, 51 *Psal.* 5. and to our Lord, 3 *Joh.* 6. nor is our Lord cross to himself, in that 18 *Mat.* 3. I resolved for brevity, else I would have spoken to these Texts more.

But what before I spake of the *Thorn*, I may apply it to this: Tho' the *Thorn* will prick, and shew itself at first, yet it is not so bad then, and apt to hurt, as it will do two years after, when it runs into a Man's flesh. So the sins of these little ones, tho' cross to the holiness of the Law, yet they have not that degree of evil and guilt, with the same acts in adult Persons.

I said Mr. *Grantbam* is very unsound, or he must contradict himself: How to reconcile his former sayings, with what he writes page 13. I know not. If this be your *sence*, *Children polluted by Original Sin, so under Condemnation, before they can come to Heaven, must be cleansed from these pollutions.* I agree [then you are on my side, against your own Sect, whom yet you justify.]

But the question is, *Whether they cannot be cleansed from Sin, without they have Faith and Repentance ?*

You mistake Mr. *Grantbam*, the question was, *Whether God Regenerates any Infants ?* which your Sect denied.

It was your Disciple that told me, That *Faith and Repentance* are the two parts of *Regeneration*. From his telling me thus, I argued.

They that are Regenerated, have *Faith and Repentance* [they that have the *whole*, have the *parts*] this is his Doctrine.

But all Infants saved, are Regenerated, say I, from Christ's words, 3 *Joh.* 3. 5.

Therefore, all Children saved have *Faith and Repentance* [i. e. *feminally*].

pag. 11.

To this you answer for him : *He that granted this, extends it only to the Adult, of whom these are required. So that this is but a meer Caption, unbecoming a grave Disputant.*

It seems he wanted your Wit to express himself plainly. But as for you who thus help him, according to your Doctrine then, there are *two Regenerations* ; one for Infants, another for Men when their Beards



Beards are grown, I pray do you define these two *Regenerations*, and shew us how they differ; then bring forth the plain Scriptures upon which you ground these, and prove your two Definitions. I never read but of *one* Regeneration in the Holy Canon; for your *two* Regenerations, I suppose you must fetch your proof from 23 *Revel. 19.*

That Infants saved must be Regenerated, the Text is clear 3 *John 3.* *ἵνα μὴ ᾖ.* The word *ᾖ* is an indefinite word, limited to no age, Infant or Adult. Infants are born *once*, but whoever are generated, and born after the ordinary course of Man, if saved, must be born *twice*, or *again*. [*Nicodemus* *ἀκούσας*, in the fourth *verse* tells us how Christ's *ἔργον*, in the third *verse* is to be translated] so must Infants, else no Heaven. Secondly, That which is *born of the flesh, is flesh*, 3 *Joh. 6.* So are all Infants, then they must be *born of Water, and the Spirit*, ver. 5. else no Heaven for Infants. Besides the other Scriptures I mentioned before.

I should define Regeneration thus: It is a work of the (a) (a) 3 *Joh.* Spirit of God in fallen Man, dead in sin (b), whereby, infu- 5. sing a principle of Spiritual Life (c), causing an habitual Confor- (b) 2 *Eph.* mity of all the Faculties of the Soul, to the Image and Will of <sup>1.</sup> God (d), all the Faculties are inclined [*actu primo*] to live the (c) 2 *Eph.* Life of God (e); by the same Spirit acting (f) this first Grace, (d) 4 *Eph.* they do [*actu secundo*] bring forth the fruits of Spiritual Life; and 24. by the (g) Indwelling, and continued acting of that good Spirit, they (e) 4 *Eph.* continue so to do, till Man comes to Glory. 18.

Mr. *Grif.* told me, he did not say God *could not* Regenerate (f) *Phil. 13.* Infants, but God *doth not* Regenerate. But I say, if God *can* 1 *Phil. 11.* do it, then according to his revealed Will, he *must* do it, if In- 15 *Joh. 5.* fants be saved. And as for the first part of the Definition, God (g) 2 *Tim.* *can* do, and *doth* work it in all Infants, in which [to use the Me- 1. 14. & taphor] are sown the Seeds of Faith and Repentance, as well as 1 *Rom. 11.* of any other Graces. For what difficulty there should be in sow- 1 *Pet. 15.* ing the Seeds of *Faith and Repentance*, more then all other Graces, 1 *Cor. 1.8.* I cannot tell.

You tell me, pag. 25. *Infants have no Object of Faith propounded to them, therefore they cannot have Faith seminally.*

*Ans.* Nor is there an Object of Love propounded to them. God is the Object of our Faith and Love, so is Christ, 14 *Joh. 1.* But God is not propounded an Object of Faith, and Love to In- fants, therefore Infants are saved without any Seminal Faith in, or Love to God, as much as to say without any Grace at all.



I shall add but this : If there be no Seeds of Repentance and Faith in Christ, in the Regeneration of Infants, then the Righteousness, the Sacrifice, Blood of Christ, with all the benefits of the *Covenant of Grace*, are imputed and applyed to persons, where are only the Seeds of the Graces of the *Covenant of Works*, which no Man shall make me believe.

That the Lord doth Regenerate Infants saved, I doubt not ; but how he doth it, neither Man nor Angel can tell. But you tell your Reader, p. 24. *I vainly pretend to know it.*

I had been a vain Man indeed, had I pretended to it. But Mr. *Grantham*, if you be a Man of Truth, name the page [ as I do always when I charge you ] in my Book, where your Reader may find what you tell him of me. I can name the page 74, where I have spoken the contrary, as expressly as a Man can speak. You tell your Reader, p. 31. *of some old Professors, that have been Teachers of others, and yet have not learned Civility or Honesty, in treating those who differ from them in Opinion.* Who is more guilty of this then Mr. *Grantham*, how many Falshoods have you charged me with in this Pamphlet. I resolve to meddle no more with *Anabaptists* for your sake ; not because I find any strength in you ; but for your charging such things upon me which I never spake, or have expressly spoken the contrary.

Because I used this Argument for the necessity of *Childrens Regeneration*. All the Members of the Kingdom of Heaven are holy : But Infants are Members of the Kingdom of Heaven ; Ergo, they are holy. But they are not holy by Birth, it is by Regeneration. You tell me, p. 13. *Here I think you have given your Cause its Deaths-blow. What is become of the Birth-Priviledge so much gloried in by Mr. Baxter, and others ?*

*Ans.* Do you think so Mr. *Grantham* ? I do not think I have given it the least wound. Did Mr. *Baxter*, or others of our Divines, ever say, Children are *inherently holy* by Birth ? You see I distinguish between Birth-holiness, and Regeneration. Did the Apostle when he tells the believing *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. That their Children were *Saints*, mean they were *inherently holy* by Birth ? No sure, he meant no more then as the Children under *Abraham's Covenant* were called *holy*, 7 Deut. 6. and 14 Deut. 2. 9 Ezra 2. That Holiness gave them a Title to Church-Membership, and the Seal of the Covenant then, so it do now.

Only a word to the Reason why you and your Disciple deny Children, can have any *Seminal Faith*, or *Regeneration*, because these come by the Word preached, 10 Rom. 17. 1 Pet. 1. 23. But  
In-

*Infants can neither understand it, nor read it.* Thus you have tyed up the Holy One to one instrument. But I pray, are all that are born *Deaf* damned? They can neither hear, read, nor understand the word: Verily, if God can Regenerate those who are born *Deaf*, he can *Infants* without hearing or reading the Word. So he did before in Circumcision where he pleased, through the word of his Covenant, *I will be their God*; and so he doth now in *Baptism*, when and where he pleaseth. *Sanctification*, and *Salvation* being given to Baptism, as an Instrument in the hand of the Spirit, 3 *Tit.* 5. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. 5 *Ephes.* 26. besides that controverted Text, 3 *Joh.* 5. which the *Anabaptists* who put so much in *Dipping*, may well understand of Baptism.

That you might make your Reader know what a pitiful Disputant I am, you tell him *two faults* I am guilty of in my Logick, p. 10. My Argument was this:

They who are Regenerated have Faith and Repentance.

But all Infants saved are Regenerated; *Ergo*, they have Faith and Repentance.

My first fault is this, *Your Major should have been universal*, say you.

And is it not *universal*? It is not *special*, for it is neither particular, nor proper, then it must be *universal*. It is *Axioma*, *καὶ δὲ τοῦ πρῶτου*. Mr. Grantham then it must be universal: For here *prædicatum recipiatur cum subiecto, ita ut ex prædicato fieri possit subiectum*: As in this proposition, *Homo est animal rationale* & *Animal rationale est Homo*. So here, they that have the *whole* have the *parts*, and they who have the *parts* have the *whole*.

A Proposition may be *universal* in the form of it, tho' it be not true, but this is both universal and true, till you can prove your *two Regenerations*.

2. The second fault is *Ignoratio Elenchi*.

Say you so Mr. Grantham; What was the Question I pray? Was it not, *whether Infants saved, had Faith and Repentance*? Did I not stick to the question, and conclude it affirmatively, from your own Disciple's Doctrine and Concessions, that they are the *two parts of Regeneration*; but that they were *Regenerated*, I proved.

Do you Mr. Grantham understand what *Ignoratio Elenchi* is?

You tell your Reader, p. 12. speaking of me, *It is his manner to confound his Discourses with Diversities*. I challenge you Mr. Grantham, or any of your Sect, to shew me where once I have stated a Question, that in my Discourse I depart from it, to another thing diverse from it. I did not so in this place: For the Question was, *Whether Seeds do not go before Fruits, Principles before Actions*?

So



So God sow the Seeds of Grace, infuse Divine Principles into Infants that are saved, tho' they die before they come to act. I mentioned *Peter*, but I did not argue thus: *Peter* had a Seed, therefore he could not fall *totally* and *finally*: that had been another Question indeed; but I said, tho' *Peter* did fall, yet there was a *Seed* in him; I aimed only at the word *Seed*, of which I was discoursing, as a word being used in Scripture.

Page 15.

To my fourth Argument I used, *viz.* If all dying Infants are justified and saved without Regeneration; then there are millions in Heaven, in whom the Spirit of God, as the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity, had nothing to do in their Salvation.

You give two Answers, the first very absurd; only I resolved to be short, else I would have shewn it.

Your second is this:

*All these dying Infants for whom Christ shed his precious Blood, have sufficient assistance from the Spirit, in the business of their Salvation. But he shed for all.*

The Major you prove thus: *They do not resist the Holy Ghost.*

I answer: The work of the Spirit in the business of their Salvation, is their *Regeneration*, their *Sanctification*: then we are agreed, you yield me the Question against your own Party; and this shall not displease me, if they be all saved, as you falsely tell your Reader. Yet I am not satisfied in your Discourse.

*Infants have sufficient assistance, because they do not resist*, say you. This is something odd methinks.

*First*, What then are Infants *active*, tho' weak, and so the Spirit assist them; for so I conceive *assistance* doth properly respect one that *acts*, but is too weak to perfect his act. Are we said properly to assist them who do nothing at all? we assist *weak* men, not *dead* men.

*Secondly*, Do the Spirit work *morally*, by way of *Suasion* with Infants, and they not resist him, as they 7 *Acts* 51.

*Thirdly*, The corrupt Nature in Infants incline them to resist him, and not to comply with him.

*Fourthly*, Are you sure that Christ shed his Blood for every *Individual* dying Infant *intentionally*? 2. And was it not for *all* Infants as well as *dying* Infants? 3. And did he shed it for them only while they were Infants, and not when they grew up to be adult? 4. And doth he then give to them all *sufficient* Grace? 5. And is that *sufficient* Grace *statu lapso*, that doth not attain its end? If the stony Heart that is to be taken away, be for stoniness *six Degrees*, the Grace which takes it away must be *seven Degrees*, else 'tis not sufficient. 6. How comes it about then that Christ fails so much, even the



the far greatest part in his *Intentions* ? Certainly the Father and the Son had the same Intentions, when the Covenant of Redemption passed between them.

But p. 16, you propound a profound Question, *viz.*

*Whether the Covenant of Grace was taken from the whole World, and appropriated only to Abraham and his Seed, from the time of making the Covenant of Circumcision, 17 Gen. 7.*

I prithee *Thomas*, how came this Question into thy Crown ? My shallow Brains could not have invented it. Will you fasten this upon me too, when my words are expressly the contrary, p. 20. *By the Covenant made with Abraham and his Seed, and the Seal of it, God did separate and divide Abraham's Seed from the World, living under that Covenant you speak of.* How was this Covenant taken from the World, Mr. *Grantham*, when I tell you expressly the *World lived under it*, tho' that Covenant was made with *Abraham* and his Seed ?

Take my Mind thus : There was one short and Enigmatical Discovery of Christ, and Gospel-Grace, 3 Gen. 15. *In the Seed of the Woman.* After this, tho' there were thousands in the World, yet God singles out *Abraham*, and makes another Discovery to him, *In thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, 12 Gen. 3.* Whence the Apostle, 2 Heb. 16. *He that took on him the Seed of Abraham ; not of Noah, nor any Man else.* After God had given this Promise which concerned the whole World, the benefit whereof divers that were not of the Church of the *Jews* did partake of, I doubt not ; God was pleased to make a Covenant with *Abraham* to be the God of him and his Seed, and commanded this Covenant to be sealed, and thus did distinguish his Seed from the World, living under the Promise made first to *Abraham*. This *Abraham*, not *Noah*, God honours with the Title of *the Father of Believers*. Gentile Believers are called *Abraham's Children*, not *Noah's*. They are grafted into *Abraham's Stock*, not *Noah's*. As then *Abraham's Seed*, born under that Covenant, were Members of the Church with their Parents, had the initiating Ordinance applied to them : So the Gentile Believers [whose Father *Abraham* is] Seed being under the Covenant of their Father *Abraham*, are Members of the Gospel-Church with their Parents, have a right to the initiating Ordinance, *Baptism* : unless it can be proved that God hath nulled *Abraham's Covenant expressly* \* : which all the *Anabaptists* in *England* can never do. And this is no *obscure Consequence*, as you call it, to prove Infant-Baptism, but it is far more clear, plain, intelligible, then that Consequence by which our Lord proved the great Article of our Resurrection.

4 Rom. 11.  
16. 18.  
3 Gal. 29.  
11 Rom.  
17.

\* See my  
Scripture  
Warrant,  
p. 8, 9.

As for *Noah*, about whom you spend so many lines, we honour him as much as you : But do you shew where God made such a Covenant with him and his Seed, as he did with *Abraham* and his Seed, and sealed it. So that *Noah's* Seed might humbly and believingly lay hold upon God for their God, by way of Covenant ; else all your words about *Noah*, are but your rambling from the Question, a meer *Ignoratio Elenchi*, as I told you before.

Then you scribble something about *Free-will*, and tell me of Mr. *Baxter's* Judgment : I am of his Opinion, I will not enter into that Controversie ; only two things I say.

First, *Liberty* as it is opposed to *natural necessity*, and *co-action* is essential to the *Will*. In the work of the Father drawing the Soul to Christ, the *Will* in closing with, and embracing of Christ is as free in respect of *Co-action*, as it was in finning against Christ. What would you have more Mr. *Grantbam* ?

Secondly, *Liberty* and some *necessity* may stand together, viz. *Libertas Consequentiae*, else the *Will* must be more than brutish.

But if you have a mind to shew what a gallant Fellow you are in this Controversie, I desire you to read and answer two Men who lived in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, *Bradwardin*, and *Fansenius*, his *Augustinus* ; I name no Protestants. But *Fansenius* I commend to you upon this account : Because as I was informed by a sober *Dutch* Minister, whose Uncle was at *Fansenius's* Commencement ; as you were bound first to a *Taylor*, so he was bound first to a *Carpenter* : but he was so exceedingly Bookish while but a Youth, that his Master wished his Parents to take him away, get some help of Friends, and put him to School ; there indeed he differs from you, as your Admirer tells us here, that you served out your Apprentiship. But there is a second difference : This excellent Carpenter chose such Timber, and built so strong, that all the Jesuits [your Friends in this Controversie] could never shake his Building. But you that were a *Taylor*, do but as *Adam* did, *sew Fig-leaves together, to make an Apron*, which will not cover your nakedness.

F I N I S.